

REMARKS

Claims 41-57 and 71-78 were pending in this application. In order to expedite the prosecution of the present application and without conceding to the validity of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants have canceled claims 41, 43, 46, 48, 49, 71, 73, 75 and 77, without prejudice to Applicants' rights to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims in a related application, and have amended claims 42, 44, 45, 47, 72 and 76 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, claims 42, 44 and 45 were amended to recite that the embryonated egg is six to eight days old. Claims 47, 72 and 76 have been amended to make the claims dependent from claims 42, 44 and 45. The amended claims are fully supported by the specification of the present application, see, *e.g.*, page 24, lines 11-18 and page 26, lines 3-7, and do not constitute new matter. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 42, 44, 45, 47, 50-57, 72, 74, 76 and 78 will be pending in the present application.

The amendments and remarks made herein narrow the issues on appeal and are designed to place the application into condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the amendments and remarks made herein be entered and fully considered.

1. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants note that the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS"), revised PTO 1449 form and references listed on the revised PTO 1449 form filed on June 11, 2003 in the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") using "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under Express Mail Label No. EV 335 855 811 US were not acknowledged in the Office Action Summary. For the Examiner's convenience, copies of the IDS and revised PTO 1449 form filed on June 11, 2003 in the USPTO are enclosed herewith. As evidence of the fact that the IDS, revised PTO 1449 form and references listed on the revised PTO 1449 form were filed on June 11, 2003 in the USPTO and received by the USPTO, Applicants enclose herewith: (1) Exhibit A, a copy of Express Mail Label No. EV 335 855 811 US with the "date-in" June 11, 2003 and "time-in" 06:50 and (2) Exhibit B, a copy of the postcard, which listed on one side the items filed on June 11, 2003 and Express Mail Label No. EV 335 855 811 US, returned to Applicants' attorneys stamped received by the USPTO with the date of June 11, 2003. Accordingly, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.10 (a), Applicants did, indeed, file the IDS, revised PTO 1449 form and references listed on the revised PTO 1449 form on June 11, 2003 in the USPTO.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider References DE-DH listed on the revised PTO Form-1449 filed in the USPTO on June 11 2003. If any of these references cannot be located, please contact the attorneys for Applicants so that they may provide additional copies of the references.

**2. THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103
SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 41-57 and 71-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitsuhashi (U.S. Patent No. 4,659,569; "Mitsuhashi") and Sasaki (JP 59-39831; "Sasaki"). The Examiner contends that Mitsuhashi and Sasaki teach eggs infected with viruses, particularly influenza viruses, and that embryonated eggs less than 10 days old are susceptible to virus infection and replication. The Examiner admits that the references do not teach the specific viral strains claimed. See Office Action mailed August 26, 2003, at page 3, lines 10-11. Despite this admission, the Examiner alleges that the composition of the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, because "it is notoriously old and well known in the art to propagate viruses in such eggs" and "one would have been motivated to make the composition because one would reasonably expect the infected egg to yield replicated virus." For the reasons detailed below, however, the rejection of claims 41-57 and 71-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot stand and should be withdrawn.

A finding of obviousness requires a determination of the scope and content of the prior art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art, and whether the differences are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. *Graham v. Deere* 383 U.S. 1 (1996). The proper inquiry is whether the art suggests the invention, and whether the art provides one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success. *In re O'Farrell* 853 F.2d 894, 7 USPQ2d 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Both the suggestion and the reasonable expectation of success must be founded in the prior art and not in the Applicants' disclosure. *In re Vaack* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In order to expedite the prosecution of the application and without conceding to the validity of the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 42, 44 and 45 (and claims

dependent therefrom) to recite an embryonated egg six to eight days old containing the specified attenuated influenza viruses. In particular, claim 42 has been amended to recite an embryonated egg six to eight days old containing a recombinantly engineered influenza virus having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response, wherein the virus is not influenza C virus. Claim 44 has been amended to recite an embryonated egg containing in the allantoic cavity an attenuated influenza virus having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response, wherein the embryonated egg is six to eight days old and the virus is not influenza C virus. Claim 45 has been amended to recite an embryonated egg six to eight days old containing delNS1.

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention, *i.e.*, an embryonated egg six to eight days old containing delNS1 or an attenuated influenza virus having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response. There is no recognition, suggestion or appreciation in Mitsuhashi to propagate influenza virus in embryonated eggs of a particular age, much less to propagate delNS1 or an attenuated influenza virus having a mutation in NS1 that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response in embryonated eggs six to eight days old. Mitsuhashi teaches the use of ten day old embryonated eggs for the propagation of influenza virus. Mitsuhashi does not teach using an embryonated egg less than ten days old for the propagation of influenza virus. Mitsuhashi only teaches the use of eight day old embryonated eggs to propagate Newcastle disease virus. Newcastle disease virus and influenza virus belong to different families of RNA viruses and have different characteristics from each other. For example, influenza virus belongs to the *Orthomyxoviridae* family, has a segmented genome, has a diameter of 80-120 nm and replicates in the nucleus. In contrast, Newcastle disease virus belongs to the *Paramyxoviridae* family, has a non-segmented genome, has a diameter of about 150 nm and replicates in the cytoplasm. *See, e.g.*, Wolfgang K. Joklik *et al.*, Zinsser Microbiology, 656-657 (19th edition 1988). Thus, the propagation of Newcastle disease virus in embryonated eggs eight days old would not suggest or motivate one of skill in the art to propagate an influenza virus in embryonated eggs eight days old or less. In fact, the teaching in Mitsuhashi regarding the propagation of influenza virus would suggest or motivate one of skill in the art to use embryonated eggs ten days old to propagate influenza virus.

Sasaki relates to propagating a swine influenza virus in the allantoic cavity of an embryonated egg of 9-11 days of age. Sasaki does not teach or suggest an embryonated egg six to eight days containing an attenuated influenza virus having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response. In both Sasaki and Mitsuhashi, the propagation of influenza virus in embryonated eggs 9-11 or 10 days old, respectively, was sufficient for the preparation of influenza virus vaccines. Thus, neither teaching in Sasaki or Mitsuhashi would motivate one of skill in the art to produce an embryonated egg six to eight days old containing delNS1 or an attenuated influenza virus having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response.

Moreover, as of the effective filing date of the present invention, the accepted age for embryonated eggs as a growth substrate for growth and propagation of influenza virus was 10-12 days, and not embryonated eggs 6 to 8 days old, as claimed in the present invention. Immature embryonated eggs, such as six to eight day old eggs were not recognized by one of skill in the art as a substrate for growth and propagation of influenza virus, prior to the present invention. In light of the fragile condition, small allantoic cavity and small nucleus of these young eggs, the prevailing view of those skilled in the art was that they were particularly unattractive for growth and propagation of influenza virus. Accordingly, there would have been no motivation for one of skill in the art, given the state of the art as of the effective filing date of the present application to use an immature embryonated egg six to eight days old for growth and propagation of influenza virus.

Applicants were the first to teach that the introduction of mutations in the NS1 gene of influenza viruses diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response (see, *e.g.*, the specification of the present application at page 14, line 23 to page 15, line 10; page 17, line 36 to page 18, line 12; and Example 6, page 38, line 7 to page 42, line 30). Further, Applicants were the first to teach that immature embryonated eggs (*e.g.*, six to eight day old embryonated eggs) provide a better growth substrate for an attenuated influenza virus having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to antagonize the cellular interferon response than older embryonated eggs (*e.g.*, 10 and 12 day old embryonated eggs) which are the conventional substrates for growth and production of influenza virus. In particular, Applicants demonstrated that an immature embryonated egg, especially its allantoic cavity, is an excellent growth substrate for attenuated influenza viruses having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to

antagonize the cellular interferon response. The cited art does not recognize or appreciate that immature embryonated eggs (*e.g.*, six day old eggs) are a better substrate for the propagation of attenuated influenza viruses having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to induce a cellular interferon response. It was Applicants' unexpected discovery that attenuated influenza viruses having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to induce a cellular interferon response grow to a higher titer in immature embryonated eggs that resulted in the recognition of immature embryonated eggs as a suitable substrate for the propagation of such viruses. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, immature embryonated eggs six to eight days old containing an attenuated influenza virus having a mutation in the NS1 gene that diminishes or eliminates the ability of the NS1 gene product to induce a cellular interferon response are not rendered obvious over the references cited by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot stand and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of the foregoing remarks. Applicants believe that all of the present claims meet all of the requirements for patentability. Withdrawal of all rejections is requested.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (212) 790-6431.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 26, 2004

Laura A. Coruzzi 30,742
Laura A. Coruzzi (Reg. No.)

JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, NY 10017
(212) 326-3939

By: Jennifer D. Chheda
Reg No. 46,617



EV 335855811 US

**EXPRESS
MAIL**

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

Customer C

JUN 11 2003

Post Office to Address

ORIGIN (POSTAL USE ONLY)

PO Zip Code 10017	Day of Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Next <input type="checkbox"/> Second <input type="checkbox"/>	Flat Rate Envelope <input type="checkbox"/>
Date in Mo. 6 Day 11 Year 03	Time in <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PM	Postage \$
Weight 2 lbs. 11 ozs.	Military <input type="checkbox"/> 1st Day <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Day <input type="checkbox"/> 3rd Day	Return Receipt Fee
No Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Weekend <input type="checkbox"/> Holiday	Int'l Alpha Country Code	COD Fee Insurance Fee
Acceptance Clerk Initials LN		Total Postage & Fees \$ 21.08

DELIVERY (POSTAL USE ONLY)

Delivery Attempt Mo. Day	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature
Delivery Attempt Mo. Day	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature
Delivery Date Mo. Day	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature
WARRANTY OF SIGNATURE The United States Postal Service warrants that the signature of the addressee or authorized agent of the addressee will appear on the delivery receipt for this item. If the signature of the addressee or authorized agent of the addressee does not appear on the delivery receipt, the item will be returned to the sender. This warranty does not apply to items that are delivered by registered mail, certified mail, or insured mail. This warranty is void if the item is delivered to a business address and the delivery receipt is not signed by an authorized agent of the business.		

CUSTOMER USE ONLY

METHOD OF PAYMENT: Express Mail Corporate Acct. No.

Federal Agency Acct. No. or Postal Service Acct. No.

FROM: (PLEASE PRINT)

PHONE 212 790 2842

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
FL 17
NEW YORK NY 10036-2720

TO: (PLEASE PRINT)

PHONE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1

PRESS HARD.

You are making 3 copies.

FOR PICKUP OR TRACKING CALL 1-800-222-1811 www.usps.com

